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BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE
Implications of Misclassification of Melanoma Thickness Measurement (Breslow’s Depth) in Detroit SEER Data, 2004-2010
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RESULTS
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RESULTS (cont.)

Initial misclassifying and misclassification of melanomas thickness led to understimation of survival rates for very-thin melanomas and would have led to an incorrect conclusion in hypothesis testing for the hazard ratio of the melanoma thickness category.

These findings suggest:

• Implied decimals should be avoided in coding schemes.
• American Cancer Registries require more training in metric system measurements and in Breslow’s Depth.
• Registrars should refrain from coding from memory. Other tumor size measures are coded in centimeters, which may have contributed to confusion over decimal placement.
• Collaboration of researchers is an essential supplement to routine quality checking.
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• A Cox regression was performed to compare the effect of misclassification on estimated hazard ratios.
• Hazard ratios were adjusted by age and sex. Race was determined to not effect the Cox regression model significantly.